

NATIONAL CAPITAL REGIONAL PLANNING COUNCIL
7013 Interior Building
Washington, D. C.

CIRCULAR MEMORANDUM NO. 57

DEC 5 1955

TO: Members, Alternates and Staff

FROM: Paul C. Watt, Director

SUBJECT: Report on the proposal of the Central Intelligence Agency to locate a new headquarters building on the Bureau of Public Roads property at Langley, Virginia

The Executive Committee has directed me to prepare a report presenting the planning considerations as well as an analysis of the consultants' report recommending the Langley site. Since the proposal referred to the Council recommends only the Langley site, this report will be concerned only with that site.

The Executive Committee, through the Chairman, addressed a letter to each of the member jurisdictions asking for their comments as to the effect of the proposal on their areas. This report will include the statements received in answer to those letters with particular emphasis on the report from Fairfax County within whose boundaries the proposed installation would be located.

There was not sufficient time or facilities to reproduce the maps and diagrams referred to in the report. They will be discussed during the meeting when the report is presented.

Background

The Regional Council first had this matter of a site for a new headquarters building for the Central Intelligence Agency referred to it on March 11, 1955. As the Council has participated in a considerable number of studies, reports, and actions on this subject in the ensuing nine months, it is important to review briefly what has happened up to the present proposal as background for this report.

The initial referral on March 11, 1955 was a request by the CIA for consideration of a site at Langley, Virginia. The Council appointed a three man committee to make a report, after conferring with representatives of Fairfax County as required by Public Law 592. The Council staff was directed to study the matter and report. Fairfax County reported by resolution of their planning commission on March 21, 1955 that CIA be invited to Fairfax County, not specifically Langley, provided the Federal Government pay for the necessary public facilities. The Council staff submitted a report on April 1, 1955 setting forth the planning considerations and raising certain questions as to the economic feasibility of the proposal. The Council committee submitted a majority report on April 7, 1955 approving the Langley site provided the Federal Government would pay for the necessary public facilities. One member of the committee submitted a dissenting statement opposing Langley on planning considerations.

Before this report was transmitted to the Planning Commission, in accordance with the law, a letter was received from CIA dated April 4, 1955, stating that "in view of the many problems developing in connection with the use of the Langley property we have decided to omit from the proposed legislation any language which would provide for the extension of the George Washington Memorial Parkway without which we do not believe use of the Langley property would be feasible." This letter was read at a Joint Meeting of the Council and the National Capital Planning Commission on April 7, 1955. A Joint Committee was then appointed by the two bodies charged with recommending alternate sites. A joint staff committee was assigned to work with representatives of the CIA to study potential sites based on criteria to be determined by the committee. The joint staff committee agreed on planning criteria and agency criteria to be used in analyzing potential sites. Hearings were held whereby anyone with a site for consideration was heard, including all the member jurisdictions. 30 or more sites were studied with 6 meeting the established criteria. The Joint Committee approved the staff report and submitted the report to the Council and Commission on May 2, 1955. The Council and the Commission adopted the criteria and the six sites. This action will be discussed later in the report.

- 3 -

On May 4, 1955 Fairfax County amended their previous action and announced that CIA would be welcome and that the county government stood "ready to cooperate fully in all matters under its own responsibilities." Between that May 4, 1955 date and November 8, 1955, when the present consultants proposal was officially referred to the Council by the Planning Commission a considerable number of reports and actions were recorded presenting varying viewpoints as to sites and their qualifications. An earlier memorandum was distributed presenting a chronology of the material received by the Council.

Planning Considerations - General

As your staff director I consider it my duty to present to you the planning policies now guiding the Council and relate the affect of any proposal on that policy. The Council, as a regional planning body, is responsible by law to study this proposal as it affects the general plan of the National Capital region as well as to confer and report on the result such a proposal may have on the local planning policy of the affected member jurisdiction or jurisdictions.

The Regional Council is now well along in developing the general plan for the region that it is charged by law in adopting. Past planning policy in the region has established the following planning considerations relative to this proposal which have here-to-fore been generally adhered to.

1. Land use policy - A trough of medium to low density on both sides of the Potomac River above the proposed Little Falls water intake.
2. Zoning policy - existing and proposed zoning supporting the above-mentioned land use policy.
3. Water supply and sewage treatment policy - The Council through the appointment of the Joint Committee on "Water Supply and Sewage Disposal" has gone on record of favoring a comprehensive study of the region's water and sewer plans dependent upon the Potomac River for supply, thus requiring enumeration of land use policy to protect the river and its tributaries from pollution by discharge of sewage affluent above the water supply intake.
4. Potomac River protection policy - The Council has supported the policies of the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin and other agencies in doing everything possible to minimize the pollution of the river and to attain water quality standards allowing maximum use of the river for recreational activities.

-4 -

5. The comprehensive planning approach - The Council has adopted a work program recommending a methodical approach to developing a general plan for the region based on sound planning concepts. This means developing sound projections relating to population, economic base, land use and zoning to provide for an orderly growth of each part of the region with emphasis on a capital improvements program providing for the provision of needed public facilities in scale with the growth and economic base of the region.

If the Council is to function as a planning body as set forth in Public Law 592 it must determine if the above policies are to be followed and review proposals such as the CIA location in relation to them.

Planning Consideration - Langley Proposal

As I have presented a detailed report to you on this subject on April 1, 1955, I will brief the considerations discussed there. A copy of that report is attached as an appendix for detailed review.

Existing conditions

Land use and zoning - (refer to regional land use map) Existing land use and zoning practices have adhered to the general planning considerations discussed in this report. The area varies from medium to low density with virtually no multifamily or commercial zones.

Utilities - (refer to regional water and sewer map) Because of the medium to low density development there is minimum water and sewer service in the area. The Pimmit Run treatment plant will be under construction probably before the year is out with a capacity of 7500 persons. This is the first stage of an ultimate 15,000 to 20,000 capacity plant. Much of the area is serviced by septic tank and wells. Falls Church provides water service in the area.

Highway and transit - None of the major limited access facilities (such as George Washington Memorial Parkway, Fairfax No. 1 outer belt and Cabin John Bridge) are now in existence. Routes 123, 193, and 309 which are narrow and winding now serve the area. Chain Bridge, which is now at practical capacity because of limited approach facilities, serves the area from the District of Columbia side. There are no transit facilities now.

Potomac River protection - The existing low density with a minimum of treatment facilities presents no pollution difficulties.

*BEST COPY
AVAILABLE*

- 5 -

Schools and parks - The low density development has allowed these facilities to keep pace with the growth pattern.

Possible affects on planning considerations

It is important to emphasize in relation to the assumptions made in this section that from a planning viewpoint the Council must look not only at the affect of the proposed installation but more importantly the private development which will take place as a normal result. This private development, with its speculative aspects, will be the most difficult to control. Further, it is important to emphasize here that the planner should not be so naive as to think that the Langley area is going to be retained in its present character forever. It is going to grow considerably, but under master planning concepts this growth would be orderly and gradual based on land use and zoning modification over a period of time within which the necessary public facilities can be provided tailored to the economic base of the jurisdiction. I refer you again to the April 1, 1955 report for more detailed discussion. The viewpoint of the Fairfax planning department will also be presented in this section.

Population Growth, Land Use and Zoning - The affect of the proposed agency in relation to population growth, land use and zoning will be dependent to a large extent upon the ability of the local planning agency and the governing body to maintain reasonable control of land development. The CIA and the local jurisdiction have emphasized that it is necessary that they do so. It will be exceedingly difficult if at all possible. In fact, because of the economics involved, it will be necessary to restudy existing and proposed land use policy to be sure that it is economically feasible to hold to the existing pattern in view of the cost of immediate additional public facilities. The demands for multifamily and increased commercial uses would be inevitable.

Sewer and Water - As stated earlier, the Pimmit Run treatment plant to serve 7500 people in this first stage is to be under construction very soon. Studies of anticipated population growth, as a result of this installation, if the growth is not properly controlled could overload this plant prior to the provision of funds for the next stage of construction to serve from 15,000 to 20,000 persons. The county has stated that the agency with its 8,000 to 10,000 employees can use this facility. Any overloading that might take place could affect the pollution of the stream and add to the Potomac River problem. The water supply would not be affected as Pimmit Run discharges into the Potomac below Little Falls.

Population Growth, Land Use and Zoning - The affect of the proposed agency in relation to population growth, land use and zoning will be dependent to a large extent upon the ability of the local planning agency and the governing body to maintain reasonable control of land development. The CIA and the local jurisdiction have emphasized that it is necessary that they do so. It will be exceedingly difficult if at all possible. In fact, because of the economics involved, it will be necessary to restudy existing and proposed land use policy to be sure that it is economically feasible to hold to the existing pattern in view of the cost of immediate additional public facilities. The demands for multifamily and increased commercial uses would be inevitable.

- 6 -

The CIA installation can be served by water from Falls Church. Present supply comes from the District through Arlington County mains. Falls Church has constructed and paid for an independent main, now under construction, from the Corps of Engineers at the Little Falls station. It is probable that water expansion can keep pace provided the necessary funds are forthcoming.

Potomac River protection - The acceleration of growth in the tributary area would require closer control of sewage treatment policies relating to new and existing plants particularly above the Little Falls intake. Any material change in land use policy would reflect additional care in protecting the river for water supply and recreation.

Highways, bridges and transit - A more complete discussion of this phase will be presented in relation to the recommendation set forth in the consultants' report. Existing highway proposals can adequately serve this area. However, from the standpoint of time and cost, it is evident that most of the long-range projects set for stage completion and related to present financing practices would have to be provided immediately to serve the proposed installation. This would include such projects as Virginia Route 123, George Washington Memorial Parkway, Cabin John Bridge, Chain Bridge, Glebe Road and possibly others.

Transit will be non-existent until highway facilities are provided.

Schools, Parks - It has been estimated that 5 new elementary schools and one high school would be required under existing standards related to population growth. Four times the present park area would be needed under the requirements of the park standards as related to population growth.

Costs - This matter will be discussed further relating to the consultants' report. As a planning consideration it is important because any acceleration of the financing program will tend to reflect on the comprehensive planning approach. Planning is best justified by providing an orderly growth tailored to the ability of the jurisdiction to provide needed public facilities. In such a proposal as this it is imperative to set forth the allocation of costs, Federal, State, and county, to see how they are fitted to the ability of each to pay their share. If one jurisdiction has to pay more than their share, then improvements in other sectors of the region can be affected. For example, the Virginia highway department allocates funds on the pay-as-you-go basis with only so much for all the projects in the Northern Virginia area.

Fairfax planning viewpoint - affect on Langley area

The following discussion represents conferences with the Fairfax County planning staff, material from the report submitted by nine members of the Fairfax Planning Commission and other county representatives in support of the Langley proposal. The County Board has on three separate occasions (May 4, 16 and 18) endorsed the location of the CIA in the county. Two of those motions referred to the Langley site.

Land use and zoning - The Fairfax Planning staff in support of the action taken by their planning commission (see appendix) emphasizes that in their judgment the land use and zoning policies developing a sound, planned growth of the Langley area can be maintained. They emphasize that the consultants' Master Plan is in the process of being reviewed as to its land use recommendations on a county-wide basis. They state that existing growth patterns in the Langley area could justify changes in their recommendation whether CIA comes in or not. The report of the nine members of the Planning Commission (see appendix) supports the staff position. This report indicates that the Master Plan once approved can be maintained. This report emphasizes the stand taken by the new county supervisor representing the Langley area in support of maintaining the existing character through proper zoning. This group believes that most of the CIA employees will remain in their present communities and not move closer to the site.

Sewer and water - The planning staff emphasizes that most of the area in the vicinity of Langley is now in the area for which sewer and water will be provided. The staff states that the new Pimmit Run plant will be in before the installation, and can be expanded at minimum cost. The staff further states that the new policy of the State Water Control Board should adequately protect the water supply from stream pollution.

The report of the Planning Commission members states that the county can assure the CIA adequate sewage facilities within a two-year period from the proceeds of a 20 million dollar sewer bond issue. They also reiterate that the new Falls Church main will provide adequate water service to the site.

Highways - The staff stated that the Virginia Department of Highways has agreed to construct concurrently with the George Washington Memorial Parkway, Route 123 from Langley corner (junction of Route 193) to a connection with the Parkway below the site. Both the staff and the members of the Planning Commission state that with the Parkway and the improvement to Route 123, the site can be served. They mention that with the possibility of the outer belt qualifying for 90% Federal aid that facility with the Cabin John Bridge can be expected much sooner.

Analysis - Consultants' report

The Consultants' report along with the proposal to locate the CIA headquarters building at Langley, Virginia was referred to the Council on November 8, 1955. The Council members received copies of this report for their study. The Executive Committee directed the staff to analyze this report for today's meeting with reference only to the Langley recommendation.

General

After careful reading of this report relating to the Langley proposal, I can state that from a planning standpoint concurrence can be stated on two points. First, we all agree that any public building should have the attractive suitable site the consultants' visualize at Langley. Secondly, we are all keenly interested in seeing the George Washington Memorial Parkway, Cabin John Bridge and the outer belt constructed as soon as possible. These facilities have been energetically supported by the Council. However, to a planning body those facilities fit into the realm of project planning and must be viewed in the over-all perspective of their relationship to the whole planning picture.

The remaining data in the report pertaining to Langley can be reasonably subjected to further analysis to develop its relationship to the Council's planning policies. After careful study there were a number of points which were not clearly stated and were difficult to follow in analyzing their relation to the proposal. The CIA was contacted for clarification, and where the data was not classified, additional facts were given. Their cooperation was appreciated.

The following discussion relates to those points in the report requiring further analysis.

Criteria

The criteria stated in this report represents a serious deviation from the policy of the Council. It was stated earlier in this report that the Council and the Planning Commission created a Joint Committee to work with the CIA in studying alternate sites. The CIA, by letter on April 4, 1955, had indicated that, because of developing problems in the Langley area, they were not going to ask for funds for the George Washington Memorial Parkway without which Langley would not be feasible. The joint staff committee collaborated with representatives from the CIA in drawing up acceptable criteria from both the planning and agency viewpoint. Using that criteria the 27 sites shown on Map 1 in the consultants report, except Langley which was not considered because it did not meet the established criteria, were analyzed with 6 meeting the criteria. The Council as well as the Commission adopted this committee report with criteria on May 2, 1955. The criteria adopted in that report was not the criteria listed on page 5 of the consultants' report nor was the criteria listed on that page used by the staff committee in relation to the 27 sites shown on Map 1 in the report. The Joint Committee and Consultants' criteria are as follows.

Joint Committee Criteria

<u>Factors</u>	<u>Mandatory</u>	<u>Desirable</u>
1. Time and distance to key points (official)	10 miles and 20 minutes to Zero Milestone	7 miles 15 minutes
2. Area (suitable topography)	50 acres with 100% usability	70-100 acres
3. Accessibility		
a. Access roads and highways	To handle 3000 passenger cars per hour.	5000 per hr. and/or 2 hwy's.
b. Public transportation	Available potential	
4. Utilities: Sewer, water, power	Available to site boundary	Existing in sufficient size
5. Availability of site	2 years	Immediately
6. Computability with existing and proposed land use and comprehensive plan	Recommendations of subcommittee of NCPC and Planning Boards	

The central city criteria is as follows:

1. Time and distance to key points (official)	20 minutes to Zero Milestone	10 minutes
2. Area (suitable topography)	12 acres (for 7-story bldg. height adjusted for site area).	24 acres
3. Accessibility		
a. Access roads and highways	To handle approx. 1800 passenger cars per hr.	To handle 3000 cars per hr.
b. Public transportation	Existing and adequate	
4. Utilities: Sewer, water, power	Existing and adequate	
5. Availability of site	2 years	Immediately
6. Computability with existing and proposed land use and comprehensive plan	Recommendations of subcommittee of NCPC	

Criteria in the Consultants' Report

1. It was determined that the new headquarters of the Agency should be within a radius of ten miles and within 20 minutes by automobile from the Zero Milestone in the City of Washington.
2. It was determined that the size of the building and the number of automobiles to be parked in its immediate vicinity would require an area of not less than 100 acres.
3. It was determined that 2,300,000 sq. ft. of building floor space will be required and that it will be necessary to provide space to park approximately 4,000 automobiles and adequate means for ingress and egress for automotive traffic.
4. It was stressed that the site should lend itself to ease in carrying out the security measures that are imperative.
5. It was emphasized that the new Headquarters should have ease of communication by road to the White House, to the Pentagon, and to the offices of the Department of State.

As you can see the criteria in the Consultants' report lists mainly that of the agency with no mention of the planning criteria. If the consultants' criteria were to be used in analyzing the sites reviewed by the committee there could conceivably be other sites not reviewed in this report which could meet that criteria. This relates to the discussion on page 6 relating to consideration of several sites.

Access to Site

This section of the report requires careful analysis from the planning viewpoint. The report is rather vague and inconclusive in discussing the needed highway and bridge facilities particularly as to timing, responsibility and cost. At one point the report refers to the fact that Chain Bridge must be widened to six lanes as well as immediate improvement of Canal Road and Weaver Place, then further seems to contradict this by saying that the Parkway will carry the bulk of the traffic via Key, Memorial and Constitution bridges. The report recommends improvement of Route 123 to six lanes in the same stretch that the Virginia Highway Department indicates it will widen only to four lanes. The report discusses an additional southbound drive to the parkway from the site to Chain Bridge where, because of topographic conditions, no connection can be made. It is assumed that the report meant to stop the southbound drive at the intersection of the parkway with Route 123 (refer to highway map). The diagrams presented in the report representing vehicular egress present a sound analysis as far as they go,

however they do not indicate what happens at the convergence of the parkway and Route 123 nor the complications of the traffic assigned to Chain Bridge. Generally, the report infers that traffic will be best handled when the outer loop, Cabin John Bridge, and the Parkway on both sides of the river have been completed.

Further discussion of some of these points are necessary in attempting, with available data, to analyze the origin and destination of the assigned traffic in relation to reasonable desires. The further analysis of the traffic picture required contacting the District Highway Department, the Bureau of Public Roads and representatives in Fairfax to get additional information. CIA was requested, and furnished the following additional data relative to traffic assignment.

- 12 -

<u>PERSONNEL RESIDENCE</u>	<u>NO. OF VEHICLES</u>	<u>PROBABLE ROUTE</u>
11% Montgomery Co., Md.	440	
12½% N.W., (D.C.)	500	
	940	Chain Bridge and Route 123
24½% N.W., (D.C.)	980	
5% N.E., (D.C.)	200	
7% Prince Georges Co., Md.	280	
.3% Baltimore, Md.	12	
.1% Anne Arundel Co., Md.	4	
	1476	Key, New Constitution Ave., or Memorial Bridge and Washington Memorial Parkway
7% S.E., (D.C.)	280	
1% S.W., (D.C.)	40	
	320	Highway or Memorial Bridge and George Washington Parkway
8% Alexandria	320	
4% Prince William Co.	16	
	336	George Washington Memorial Parkway
10% Arlington Co.	400	
	400	Glebe Road and George Washington Parkway
5% Arlington Co.	200	
8% Fairfax Co.	320	
2% Loudoun Co.	8	
	528	McLean and Route 123
	4000	

This data is a straight percentage projection of employees to cars based on where they live up to a total of 4000, which is the number to be parked on the site. Traffic assignments only include CIA people as increased traffic due to private development is not included. Conference with the District Highway Department determined that this data was not sufficient to carry out the required origin and destination assignments upon which they could reasonably make a recommendation for the Chain Bridge, Canal Road and Weaver Place improvements. A further breakdown was requested from the agency in order to locate employees by zones and sub-zones to determine assignments. This information, which has always been classified, could not be given.

Chain Bridge

The agency traffic data was charted (see diagram) indicating traffic assignment by the consultants. The block arrows indicate the desired flows. The assignment indicates 940 cars for Chain Bridge (11% Montgomery Co. - 12 1/2% of the 37% in N. W. Washington), and 400 on Glebe Road bringing 1340 cars to the Route 123-Glebe Road intersection in addition to the approximately 300 cars moving in that direction now. The reverse flow in the peak hour moves 1600 cars at the present time. Recent highway studies indicate that Chain Bridge is beyond its practical capacity at the present time because of the restricted approaches. Analysis indicates that in the morning it is possible with some congestion to move the assigned traffic across the bridge to Route 123, thence to the site. However, the evening movement is quite another matter. In the morning movement will be by right turns at both Weaver Place and Route 123. The 400 cars on Glebe Road will still have to make a left turn in front of the moving reverse flow. In the evening the traffic back across the bridge will be making left turns with the heavier Glebe Road traffic outbound as well as a left turn at Weaver Place across the outbound peak on Canal Road. This Chain Bridge problem is considered in some detail because further analysis, if data were available, could conceivably cut into the 980 cars (24 1/2% of the 37% of N. W. Washington - refer to map) assigned by the consultants to Key, Constitution and Memorial bridges, thence back up the parkway. This traffic would to a degree, if it were known where all of it originated, be taken downtown on existing congested arteries at least until the parkway were completed on the Maryland-District side.

Costs

Since the report makes no statement as to the cost of the needed facilities, a tabulation is included indicating cost data prepared by Federal and State agencies emphasizing the need for knowing the timing of the various projects as well as who will pay for them.

<u>Virginia</u>	Route 123 - four-lane Langley corner to Parkway (Virginia Department of Highways say they will do this if Parkway is built)	350,000
<u>Virginia</u>	Route 123 - four-lane Parkway to Chain Bridge (No commitment Consultants report does not provide for it)	750,000
<u>Virginia</u>	Parkway - Spout Run to site (Money to be made available if site is chosen)	8,500,000
<u>District of Columbia</u>	Chain Bridge - four-lanes (No commitment - 6-lane bridge- not considered on existing Superstructure)	1,350,000
<u>District of Columbia</u>	Canal Road to Weaver Place - Weaver Place to Mac Arthur Blvd. (no commitment)	900,000

Cost data was not available for the Parkway north to Cabin John, nor for the Cabin John Bridge. If the bridge were to be a part of this project the outer-loop would be needed in Virginia at least to its junction with Route 7 approximately 5 miles west.

There is no mention of transit needs to serve the Langley site in the report.

Impact of Proposal on Fairfax County

The report indicates that it will be necessary for very few of the agency employees to relocate as 68% of them will enter the property via the parkway. This is based on the assignments previously discussed. Convenience of access to the site will be a big factor in determining how many of their people will move. The impact the report refers to only includes the CIA employees and does not include those brought into the area as a result of the locating of the facility there.

The report indicates that there will be no detrimental affects relating to land use and zoning as the authorities will maintain and uphold the zoning scheme. Pertinent discussion of these factors was reported earlier in the report.

Water Supply and Sewage

The report indicates that water and sewer facilities are guaranteed to the site by Falls Church and Fairfax County. Again there is no reference to needs required by private development as a result of the installation. The District Engineer, U. S. Corps of Engineers, when contacted for their views in this matter stated that he was informed "that the agency had assurances from Fairfax County officials that its sewage effluent would be discharged into Plunkett Run and that the Fairfax County officials in turn had assurances from the Virginia Water Control Board of necessary clearances from that agency. Where it is believed that a significant amount of residential and commercial development will grow up around a new installation, we consider it necessary that precautions be taken with respect to this type of development equal to those taken with respect to the installation."

In general the report seems to conclude that there will be some inconvenience encountered but when the improvements go in, most of which have been planned for a number of years hence, the site will be readily accessible and a distinct asset to the community.

Reports from member jurisdictions

The Chairman sent a letter to each of the member planning bodies requesting their comments as to the affect of the proposal on their jurisdiction. As these replies will be attached as appendices, I will present only a short summary of the general reaction.

Fairfax County - A letter from the Planning Director stating that the Planning Commission by majority vote had approved the Langley site. A report was also received, signed by nine members of the Fairfax Planning Commission. This report was discussed in the body of the report.

Falls Church - The Planning Commission did not meet before the meeting and therefore took no action. The City Council reiterated the city's ability to furnish water to the Langley site and enclosed a resolution approving the site.

Upper Montgomery Planning Commission - The Chairman of the Commission states "that from the point of view of this jurisdiction, the Langley site is not suitable." This is based on the number of highway facilities needed without assurances of their construction as well as the feeling that the facility would bring about change of general character seriously affecting measures to protect the Potomac River.

Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission - The Chairman of the Commission states that "after reviewing the consultants report, it is the considered opinion of this commission that the reasoning leading to their favoring the Langley site is faulty and incomplete." The letter further emphasizes that in view of the great number of improvements needed at Langley, it cannot be conclusively proved that the Greenbelt site in Maryland can be eliminated. The letter states that the Council should give careful scrutiny to the Langley site and if it is ultimately recommended, funds should be included for the extension of the parkway and the Cabin John Bridge.

Loudoun County Planning Commission - The Chairman stated that there was neither a Commission or Board of Supervisors meeting scheduled during the time given to study this matter and that no official action was taken. He went on to say that it was the opinion of the Executive Committee that Loudoun would not be affected too much should the agency go to Langley because of the distance factor.

Alexandria Planning Commission and Council - A letter from the City Manager took exception to the consultants' report in recommending Langley over the Winkler tract. The letter analyzes each section of the report indicating that Winkler best meets the criteria.

Arlington County Board of Supervisors and Planning Department - The Clerk to the Board of Supervisors states that the County Board, after lengthy discussion, endorsed the CIA site at Langley by a four-to-one vote. A report of the Planning Department was provided. This report stated that sewer and water facilities did not present any problem to the County. As to traffic, the report indicates that "certain serious congestion will occur if State and Federal highway improvements are not timed exactly with construction." The report emphasized that these improvements would require 6 lanes on the parkway from Chain Bridge, widening of Globe Road from Lee Highway to Chain Bridge, and the widening of Route 123 to 6 lanes from Chain Bridge to the site. The report states that if this is not done neighborhood damage could occur by "short-cuts" over residential streets. The report also states that if present zoning is maintained there will be no impact on the County from the agency.